

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01985 01 OF 02 111413Z

45

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 NEA-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OMB-01 EB-11 ACDA-19 IO-14

OIC-04 AEC-11 DRC-01 SAM-01 (ISO) W

----- 048690

R 111310Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5130

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

:USCINCEUR

USDOCOUTH

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1985

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: ALLIES COMPLETE MILITARY-TECHNICAL STUDY OF MEASURES
FOR THE FLANKS

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: A) STATE 56461, B) USNATO 1685, C) USNATO 1745, D) STATE 65431

BEGIN SUMMARY: MBFR WORKING GROUP ON APRIL 9 CONCLUDED WORK ON
MILITARY-TECHNICAL EXAMINATION OF MEASURES FOR THE FLANKS ("PARA 30"
MEASURES). WORKING GROUP PAPER, WHICH WILL BE FORWARDED TO SPC,
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01985 01 OF 02 111413Z

CONCLUDES THAT FIRST FIVE MEASURES WOULD BE MILITARILY INTOLERABLE
IF APPLIED RECIPROCALLY. PAPER ALSO REPORTS THAT WORKING GROUP
WAS NOT ABLE TO REACH ANY CONCLUSION ON IDEA IN SIXTH MEASURE
OF COMBINING A REDEPLOYMENT RESTRICTION WITH A NON-CIRCUMVENTION

AGREEMENT UNDER WHICH SOVIETS WOULD NOT INCREASE LEVEL OF PERMANENTLY-STATIONED FORCES IN THREE WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS AND ON FLANKS. CONCLUSIONS SECTION RE-DRAFTED ACCORDINGLY. OUTCOME IS THAT NONE OF PARA 30 MEASURES RECEIVED NATO ENDORSEMENT FROM MILITARY-TECHNICAL STANDPOINT.

FULL TEXT OF REVISED WORKING GROUP PAPER SENT SEPTTEL AND, UNLESS THERE ARE FURTHER REVISIONS, WILL BE APPROVED BY THE SILENCE PROCEDURE ON WEDNESDAY APRIL 17. MISSION BELIEVES THAT TIME HAS NOW COME TO SHIFT DEBATE FROM INCONCLUSIVE STUDY OF SPECIFIC MEASURES IN WORKING GROUP CONTEXT TO POLITICAL CONSIDERATION IN SPC OF RECENT US CONTRIBUTION ON FLANK SECURITY FORMULATIONS REF (A). WE THUS SUGGEST APPROVAL OF WORKING GROUP REPORT WITHOUT CHANGE. END SUMMARY.

1. WORKING GROUP DEVOTED MORNING OF APRIL 9 TO FIND SOLUTION FOR HANDLING MEASURE 6 IN DRAFT REPORT ON PARA 30 MEASURES (USNATO 1685). PROCEDURAL SOLUTION FINALLY WORKED OUT IN AFTERNOON PRIVATE MEETING BETWEEN US, TURKISH AND IMS REPS. THIS MESSAGE SUMMARIZES DISCUSSION LEADING TO NEXT TEXT ON MEASURE 6.

2. WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION OPENED WITH A TOUR DE TABLE WHICH FOUND ALL ALLIES, EXCEPT CANADA, IN FAVOR OF PRESENT TEXT, I.E., PARAS 27-29 ON MEASURE 6, AS TRANSMITTED REF (B). FRG AND UK REPS WERE PARTICULARLY STRONG IN SUPPORTING PRESENT TEXT, WHICH INDICATED THAT ALLIES MIGHT BE ABLE TO ACCEPT A MEASURE, COMBINED WITH A NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISION, CALLING UPON SOVIETS NOT TO INCREASE THE LEVEL OF THEIR FORCES IN THREE WMDS AND ON FLANKS. (COMMENT: UK REP TOLD US PRIVATELY THAT WITH INSERTION OF WORK "PERMANENTLY" IN PARA 28, THE MEASURE WOULD BE RENDERED INNOCUOUS, BUT WOULD SERVE TO GIVE TURKEY THE IMPRESSION THAT IT HAD SALVAGED SOMETHING FROM THE PARA 30 EXERCISE. HE SAID THAT A MEASURE AS DESCRIBED IN PARA 29 WAS ACCEPTABLE TO BRITISH MILITARY AUTHORITIES. END COMMENT.)

3. IN DEFENDING US PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TEXT ON MEASURE 6 (USNATO 1834), US REP (IN EFFORT TO DAMPEN OBVIOUS ENTHUSIASM SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01985 01 OF 02 111413Z

AROUND THE TABLE FOR GIVING "SOMETHING" TO THE FLANKS) REPEATED BASIC US VIEW THAT WHILE US FULLY SHARED CONCERN FOR SECURITY OF FLANKS, US HAD ONLY AGREED TO STUDY PARA 30 MEASURES AND NOT NECESSARILY TO ACCEPT ANY OF THEM HE NOTED THAT ONE OF THE DIFFICULTIES IN EXAMINING MEASURE 6 IS ITS AMBIGUITY. PARAS 28 AND 29 REPRESENTED ONLY ONE POSSIBLE INTERPRETATION OF PHRASE "OTHER STABILIZING MEASURES, INCLUDING NON-CIRCUMVENTING PROVISIONS." IN SO FAR AS WORKING GROUP HAD DEFINED A STABILIZING MEASURE, IN THIS CONTEXT IT WAS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AS MEASURE 3, WHICH THE PAPER HAD ALREADY FOUND TO BE MILITARILY INTOLERABLE IF APPLIED RECIPROCALLY. THE SAME CONCLUSIONS SHOULD THUS APPLY TO MEASURE 6. IN RESPONSE TO DUTCH REP'S COMMENT THAT US APPEARED TO BE AGAINST

NON-CIRCUMVENTION, US REP REPLIED THAT SPC HAS NOT STARTED STUDY OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION, AS CALLED FOR IN PARA 31 IN C-M(73)83, AND THAT THIS WAS NOT THE SUBJECT NOW UNDER EXAMINATION IN WORKING GROUP. IN ANY CASE, US ENDORSEMENT OF PARA 31 REFLECTED US INTENTION TO PURSUE THIS SUBJECT.

4. MOST OF THE ENSUING DISCUSSION TURNED ON THE WAY IN WHICH TO REGISTER MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US AND TURKY ON MEASURE 6. US REP SUGGESTED THAT REPORT GO FORWARD TO SPC ON THE FIRST FIVE MEASURES, WITH WORKING GROUP CHAIRMAN REPORTING TO SPC THAT MEASURE 6 WAS STILL UNDER EXAMINATION. TURKISH REP REFUSED THIS SOLUTION, ARGUING THAT, SINCE CLEAR MAJORITY OF ALLIES SUPPORTED PRESENT PARA 29, US SHOULD REGISTER ITS OBJECTIONS IN A FOOTNOTE. US REP RESPONDED THAT CANADA HAD SUPPORTED US AMENDMENTS AND THAT SOME OTHER ALLIES MIGHT NEED FURTHER TIME TO REFLECT ON THEM, AND THUS HE WAS NOT ABLE TO ACCEPT A FOOTNOTE PROCEDURE WHICH WOULD CREATE THE ERRONEOUS IMPRESSION THAT THE US WAS ISOLATED. NOR COULD HE ACCEPT THE CURRENT TEXT OF PARA 29 WITHOUT BRACKETS, EVEN IF IT WERE TO BE IDENTIFIED AS NOT REPRESENTING CONSENSUS VIEW. THE EMPHASIS OF THIS PARAGRAPH ON SPECIFICITY PRESAGED PRECISELY THE TYPE OF RESTRICTIVE AND DETAILED MEASURE OUTSIDE OF NGA TO WHICH THE US WAS OPPOSED.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 01985 02 OF 02 111426Z

45

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 NEA-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OMB-01 EB-11 ACDA-19 IO-14

OIC-04 AEC-11 DRC-01 SAM-01 /173 W

----- 045161

R 111310Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5131

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USCINCEUR

USDOCSOUTH

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1985

5. IN BRIEF AFTERNOON SESSION, WORKING GROUP TRIED TO BREAK PROCEDURAL DEADLOCK ON HANDLING MEASURE 6. CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT THERE WERE TWO POSSIBILITIES: ONE TO REGISTER THE FACT THAT IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO REACH ANY CONCLUSION, THE OTHER TO CONTINUE DISCUSSING QUESTION IN WORKING GROUP. HE STRONGLY FAVORED FORMER APPROACH, SINCE HE DID NOT BELIEVE THAT LATTER COURSE WOULD BRING WORKING GROUP ANY CLOSER TO CONCLUSION. US REP AGREED WITH THIS CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTED THAT TEXT ON MEASURE 6 BE ABBREVIATED TO REFLECT FACT THAT NO CONCLUSION HAD BEEN REACHED AND THAT GROUP WAS DIVIDED ON THE MILITARY ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF A REDPLOYMENT RESTRICTION/NON-CIRCUMVENTION APPROACH. HE WOULD AGREE TO DROP PROPOSED IS RE-DRAFT OF PARA 29 IF OTHERS WOULD AGREE

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01985 02 OF 02 111426Z

TO DROP PRESENT PARA 29 ALTOGETHER. US VIEWS ON PARA 29 WERE NOW A MATTER OF RECORD AND US WOULD RETURN TO THEM IN ANY FUTURE STUDY OF THIS MEASURE.

6. TURKISH REP NOTED THAT THIS WOULD AMOUNT TO A FAILURE BY WORKING GROUP TO ENDORSE ANY PARA 30 MEASURE. HE AGREED, HOWEVER, THAT CONTINUING WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION WOULD PROBABLY BE UNPRODUCTIVE AND SAID THAT HE COULD ACCEPT A SOLUTION ALONG LINES PROPOSED BY US REP.

7. CHAIRMAN ASKED US AND TURKISH REPS TO MEET PRIVATELY TO WORK OUT NEW TEXT FOR PARA 29. WHEN THIS WAS ACCOMPLISHED, INTERNATIONAL STAFF WOULD DISTRIBUTE TEXT TO ALL DELEGATIONS. UNLESS SOME DELEGATION OBJECTED TO IT BY COB, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, PAPER WOULD GO FORWARD TO SPC.

8. IN LATER PRIVATE MEETING, WHICH INCLUDED IMS REP, US AND TURKISH REPS WORKED OUT A BRIEF STATEMENT FOR PARA 29 REFLECTING WORKING GROUP'S INABILITY TO REACH AGREEMENT ON MEASURES 6 AND RECORDING FACT THAT US AND OTHERS HAD RESERVATIONS. NEW PARAGRAPH ALSO STATES THAT FURTHER STUDY OF MEASURE 6 WOULD BE DESIRABLE, ALTHOUGH IT DELIBERATELY LEAVES UNSPECIFIED AS TO WHERE THIS STUDY WOULD TAKE PLACE. TURKISH REP PERSONALLY FAVORED LEAVING THIS QUESTION AMBIGUOUS AND HINTED STRONGLY HIS REALIZATION THAT FURTHER STUDY IN THE WORKING GROUP TO REACH AGREEMENT ON A SPECIFIC MEASURE WOULD BE FRUITLESS. (DURING THIS PRIVATE MEETING, US AND TURKISH DELEGATIONS ALSO HAD LENGTHY DISCUSSION OF THEIR RESPECTIVE POINTS OF VIEWS ON PRESERVATION OF FLANK SECURITY IN MBFR. SEE SEPTEL.) AFTER FURTHER PROLONGED DISCUSSION, TURKISH AND US REPS WERE ABLE TO COMPROMISE TEXTUAL DIFFERENCES RESULTING FROM TURKISH REF (C) AMENDMENTS AND REF (D) GUIDANCE. LAST SENTENCE IN PARA 24 REMAINS, BUT IS REPHRASED TO COINCIDE WITH LANGUAGE IN LAST SENTENCE OF PARA 31. WORD "MILITARILY" REMAINS IN PARA 39(B)(2) BUT IS ALSO INTRODUCED INTO PARA 30(B)1.

9. COMMENT: FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES, THIS WORKING GROUP REPORT CONCLUDES MILITARY-TECHNICAL EXAMINATION OF PARA 30 MEASURES, AT LEAST FOR NEAR FUTURE. MISSION CONSIDERS THAT NEW TEXT UNDER

MEASURES 6 ADQUATELY PROTECTS US POSITION AND DOES NOT GIVE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01985 02 OF 02 111426Z

FLANKS A MILITARY-TECHNICAL FOUNDATION FOR PRESSING FOR SPECIFIC MEASURES FOR THE FLANKS. STATEMENT IN PARA 28 THAT MEASURES TAKEN TOGETHER WOULD HAVE SAME EFFECT AS MOVEMENT CONSTRAINTS IS ESPECIALLY HELPFUL, SINCE PAPER'S CONCLUSIONS ON MOVEMENT CONSTRAINTS ARE NEGATIVE. PARA 29 DOES REFLECT SUBSTANTIAL SUPPORT FOR SOMETHING UNDER MEASURE 6, BUT WE EXPECT THIS DEBATE TO CONTINUE IN POLITICAL FRAMEWORK OF SPC, IN WHICH ALLIES WILL BE WORKING ON BASIS RECENT US CONTRIBUTIONS ON FORMULATIONS. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS OUTCOME IS PREFERABLE TO INTERMINABLE DEBATE WITH FLANKS IN WORKING GROUP, WHICH WOULD ONLY INCREASE TREND TOWARDS THIS BECOMING A CONTENTIOUS US-TURKISH BILATERAL ISSUE, DELAY WORK IN SPC ON US POLITICAL APPROACH, AND POSSIBLY MISLEAD FLANKS INTO HOPING THAT US MIGHT ULTIMATELY ACCEPT SOME SPECIFIC MEASURE. RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 11 APR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO01985
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740482/abbryuht.tel
Line Count: 240
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 56461, B) USNATO 1685, C) USNATO 1745, D) STATE 65431
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19-Jul-2001 by worrelsw>; APPROVED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: ALLIES COMPLETE MILITARY-TECHNICAL STUDY OF MEASURES FOR THE FLANKS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ANKARA
ATHENS
BONN
COPENHAGEN
LONDON
OSLO

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005